



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/029,408	12/26/2001	Larry Caldwell	CALD-005	3760
24353	7590	03/04/2011	EXAMINER	
BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP			VU, JAKE MINH	
1900 UNIVERSITY AVENUE				
SUITE 200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
EAST PALO ALTO, CA 94303			1618	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/04/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/029,408	CALDWELL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	JAKE M. VU	1618

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 18 February 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.

/Jake M. Vu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1618

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that courts determined that when all the elements of a claimed invention are necessarily present in a single prior art reference then the claims are inherently anticipated. In this case, the Examiner has erred by relying on an assertion of inherent undiscovered benefits, not in the closest prior art method, but rather in a proposed combination of prior art references that allegedly renders the claimed method obvious. The Examiner finds this argument unpersuasive, because the courts do not REQUIRE that all the elements should be in a single prior art reference. Applicant argues that it appears the Examiner fails to acknowledge the distinction between NSAID compositions of the cited prior art and the closest art methods which do not disclose topical application of a NSAID composition to a palmar dermal surface proximal to the carpal tunnel. The Examiner finds this argument unpersuasive, because the primary art teaches using an NSAID topical composition for treating carpal tunnel syndrome, wherein the secondary reference teaches that it is common to apply topical medication on or near the site of pain. In this case, carpal tunnel syndrome pain is located in the "carpal tunnel" area. Since the primary reference's composition is the same as claimed by applicant, then it would inherently have the same effect of amelioration of at least one symptom associated with median nerve pressure for a period of 1 week or longer. Applicant argues that the Caldwell Declaration and the Declaration of Mr. Galer support the contention one of ordinary skill in the art would not have predicted success in practicing the claimed invention prior to the Applicant's work. The Examiner finds this argument unpersuasive, because one skilled in the art would have a REASONABLE expectation of success, since it is well known that NSAID treats carpal tunnel syndrome. Applicant argues that the Examiner did not provide a reason to modify the prior art composition. The Examiner finds this argument unpersuasive, because the Examiner provided the reason to modify the prior art patch to use a commercially available hydrogel patch since it is easier than making one from scratch and the prior art teaches using NSAID in a patch.